

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10 AT SEATTLE

11 LE'TAXIONE X,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 CORRECTIONS OFFICER ROCHON,  
*et al.*,

15 Defendants.

)  
)  
) Case No. C08-1430-MJP-JPD  
)  
)  
)

) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

16  
17 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY CONCLUSION

18 This is a *pro se* civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter is now before the  
19 Court on plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief. Plaintiff asserts in his motion that two  
20 corrections officers at the Clallam Bay Corrections Center, officers Cram and Germeau, have  
21 improperly searched, read, and confiscated legal documents relevant to this litigation thereby  
22 interfering with plaintiff's right of access to the courts. Plaintiff seeks an order prohibiting officers  
23 Cram and Germeau from searching his legal documents in the future and directing that legal  
24 documents which have been confiscated by these officers be returned. This Court, having reviewed  
25 plaintiff's motion, and the balance of the record, concludes that plaintiff's motion for preliminary  
26 injunctive relief should be denied.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7  
8  
9  
0

1

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

0  
1  
2  
3

1 defendants are MCC employees.<sup>1</sup> Only a single named defendant, Chaplain Duncan, is associated in  
2 any way with CBCC and plaintiff makes no allegation in either his complaint or his motion for  
3 preliminary injunctive relief that this individual has interfered with his right of access to the courts.  
4 Neither Corrections Officer Cram nor Corrections Officer Germeau, the two individuals whom  
5 plaintiff asserts have interfered with his right of access to the courts at CBCC, is a party to this  
6 action. Accordingly, this Court has no jurisdiction to enjoin their conduct.

7 CONCLUSION

8 For the reasons set forth above, this Court recommends that plaintiff's motion for  
9 preliminary injunctive relief be denied. A proposed order accompanies this Report and  
10 Recommendation.

11 DATED this 28th day of April, 2009.

12   
13 JAMES P. DONOHUE  
14 United States Magistrate Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

---

25 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff identified sixteen defendants in his civil rights complaint. However,  
26 plaintiff failed to adequately allege causes of action against seven of those defendants. Thus,  
those seven defendants were dismissed from this action prior to service. (*See* Dkt. No. 4.)